

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/901,572	OKUDA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Zachariah Lucas	1648

**All Participants:**

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Daniel A. Geselowitz.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 January 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: . . . . .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

4,5, 10, 12, 13-18

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Applicant and indicated that the claims would be inallowable condition if the following amendments were made to the claims:

In claims 4 and 5, the substitution in line 1 of the term "A" at the beginning of the claim with the phrase - - An isolated- - ;

In claims 15-18, amendment of the claims so that each occurrence of an prokaryotic cell is limited to embodiments wherein the prokaryotic cell is Mycoplasma;

In claims 4, 10, and 13-18, an identification of the portion of the genome of a prokaryotic cell encoding a DNA region encoding an NXB site such that the portion of the genome is also identified as - - encoding an antigen- - ;

In claims 12 and 15-18, the phrase "end of said DNA molecule" in supart (2) of the claim should be amended to read - - end of said DNA molecule of (1)- - .

The amendments of claims 4 and 5 is for the purpose of excluding DNA molecules that may be found in nature.

The amendment of claims 15-18 (reference to Mycoplasma) is to perfect the amendments to overcome the prior art rejections of record.

The amendment of claims 4, 10, and 13-18 is to ensure that the claimed inventions meet the utility requirement.

The amendment of claims 10, 12, and 15-18 is to clarify that "said DNA molecule" is the DNA molecule was described in subpart (1) of the claim.

The amendments were found acceptable by the Applicant, and it was indicated that they may be made by Examiners Amendment.